

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11-17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 4, and 10 have been amended, and new claims 18-19 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1, 4, 10, and 18-19 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In item 2 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7-8, 10, 13-14, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,699,104, issued to Yoshinobu (hereinafter referred to as "Yoshinobu"). By this Amendment, claims 7-8, 13-14, and 16-17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites "displaying, at the receiver, the individual message included in the view restriction information instead of a screen of the restricted program when a predetermined password is entered." The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art references do not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

Yoshinobu discloses a broadcasting channel lock system in which users who are not authorized to view a channel, or users who wish to at least temporarily block a channel being viewed, are shown a restricted view of that channel. The video component of the signal may be completely blocked, or may provide a partial view such as a moving portal on the screen. The blocking of the screens is performed with screen savers in Yoshinobu, which the Examiner has characterized as the individual message recited in claim 1. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the individual message recited in claim 1 is recited as being broadcast along with the view restriction information. This is in direct contrast to the screen savers of Yoshinobu, which are stored in a software program for displaying various kinds of the screen savers corresponding to the various video levels (Column 7, Lines 14-16). Although the Examiner cited Column 12, Lines 1-5 as indicating that the screen savers are set and updated by the broadcast signal, it is apparent that they are not included in the view restriction information broadcast together with the restricted program, as recited in claim 1.

Further, the Examiner stated that Yoshinobu discloses displaying, at the receiver, a password enter screen to lock a restricted program which may be, for example, too vulgar. However, the password referenced by the Examiner is an initialized password to indicate that a channel can be set (i.e., the channel lock can be released) upon input of the password, rather than locking a restricted program (Column 6, Lines 63-67). While Yoshinobu does discuss allowing the user to block the video signal of a broadcast which becomes too vulgar, it is through a one-touch button of a remote commander (Column 7, Lines 1-11).

Also, the Examiner stated that Yoshinobu discloses displaying the individual message included in the view restriction information when a predetermined password is entered. However, it is apparent in Yoshinobu that the screen saver is merely displayed instead of the restricted program when a parent sets a password for parental control restricting the programming, or when the parent performs the one-button process of "muting" the video signal. The Applicant respectfully submits that this is completely different from the recited method of displaying the password enter screen when the restricted program is acquired, and displaying the individual message in response to the password being entered. In Yoshinobu, the parents do not enter the lock code when the restricted program is acquired, but in advance of any such received programming. And if the password is later entered by the parents, it is to receive the programming, not the screen saver. Therefore, in at least one embodiment enabled by the features recited in claim 1, if a child attempts to put in the parents' password to receive a restricted program, he would receive the individual message from the parent. This is in direct contrast to Yoshinobu, where if the child put in the parents' password, he would be able to actually view the restricted program.

Therefore, Yoshinobu does not disclose or suggest at least the features of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Yoshinobu does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Yoshinobu does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Yoshinobu, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims 4 and 10 recite similar features to those discussed in regard to claim 1, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 10 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 4 on pages 5-6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshinobu in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,890,321, issued to Seth-Smith et al (hereinafter referred to as "Seth-Smith"). In item 5 on pages 6-7 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshinobu in view of Seth-Smith, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,272, issued to Goode et al. In item 6 on pages 7-9 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshinobu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,216, issued to Barth.

By this Amendment, claims 2-3, 5-6, 9, 11-12, and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

New Claims 18 and 19

New claim 18 is directed to a method of restricting viewing of a program which is broadcast along with view restriction information that was input by a user of a receiver. New claim 19 is directed to a method of restricting viewing of a program wherein a display message input by a user of a receiver is displayed in response to a predetermined password being entered. As previously discussed in this Amendment, these features are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 18 and 19 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11-17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 4, and 10 have been amended, and new claims 18-19 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1, 4, 10, and 18-19 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 02/08/07

By: Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501